

REMARKS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on February 23, 2009. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action, claims 28-42 were pending. By way of the present response applicants have: 1) amended claims 31, 33, 37, 38, and 42; 2) added claims 43-48; and 3) canceled claims 28-29, 32, 34-36, and 39-41. As such, claims 30-31, 33, 37, 38, and 42-48 are now pending. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Allowed Subject Matter

Applicants note, with appreciation to the Examiner, that claim 30 has been allowed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,088,788 by Borkenhagen, (hereinafter, "Borkenhagen") in view of "Sparcle: An Evolutionary Processor Design for Large-Scale Multiprocessors" by Agarwal (hereinafter "Agarwal") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,138,230 by Hervin (hereinafter, "Hervin").

In the interest of furthering prosecution and without conceding to the Office Action's rejection, applicants have canceled claim 28. Thus, the rejection of claim 28 is now moot.

Claims 29, 31-36 and 38-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borkenhagen, Agarwal and Hervin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,702 by Flynn et al. (hereinafter, "Flynn").

In the interest of furthering prosecution and without conceding to the Office Action's rejection, applicants have canceled claims 29, 32, 34-36. Thus, the rejection of claims 29, 32, 34-36 is now moot.

Applicants have amended claims 31, 33, 38, and 42 to depend from allowed claim 30. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 31, 33, 38, and 42 are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as claim 30.

Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borkenhagen, Agarwal, Hervin and Flynn in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,381,533 by Peleg et al. (hereinafter, "Peleg").

Applicants have amended claim 37 to depend from allowed claim 30. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 37 is in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as claim 30.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 43-48. While new claims 43-48 differ from claims 30-31, 33, 37, 38, and 42, they contain similar subject matter and, applicants respectfully submit, are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants submit that the new claims are supported by the specification as originally filed and add no new matter.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome.

Applicants reserve all rights under the doctrine of equivalents.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), applicants hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: May 26, 2009

/Ryan W. Elliott/
Ryan W. Elliott
Reg. No. 60,156

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300